

IMAC-QA Subcommittee
September 22, 2003
Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Joann Ator, Door Co.; Jackie Bennett, Racine Co.; Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee Co.; Chris Elms, Dane Co.; John Haine, DHFS; Lisa Hanson, DHFS; Pam Lohaus, DHFS; Lorie Mueller, LaCrosse Co.; Marilyn Rudd, DHFS; Marcia Williamson, DHFS; Rick Zynda, DHFS.

Absent: Bernadette Connolly, DHFS; Kathy Judd

Minutes from 7/28/03 Meeting: Approved as written.

Status of QA Subcommittee Performance Standard Recommendations:

The WCHSA Program Advisory Subcommittee (comprised from IMAC members, including J. Rathman; L. Green; Ed Kamin; J. Bennett; M. Pomo; M. Van Dyke, and others) met with John Haine, Marilyn Rudd and Vicki Jessup, and reviewed the PA Subcommittee recommendations on sanction and bonus pass-throughs. Nothing definitive was resolved.

- They do want the state to share in the risk along with the local agencies. They also want local agencies to have flexibility on how to use any money that is passed through to them as a bonus. The QA Subcommittee had recommended that it be used to support ES/FS workers, so that they could feel the rewards for the extra effort they have given out. The local agency reps at the WCHSA –PAC felt strongly that local agencies/counties need to be able to determine where that is best used, to reduce county budget deficits, or as needed. They did feel the existing language is sufficiently broad.
- Regarding the APE penalty methodology, they were concerned about the small agency not having a valid sample. They understand the shift to the idea that all counties pay for their error but would like to see a cap set for the amount of liability. The majority there agreed with the “No Pain- No Gain” idea: if you don’t share the penalty (when you have no cases selected, then you don’t share the bonus either.

Additional Discussion on potential sanctions and error rates:

- Jacaie C. reminded this group that if the state is not sanctioned then there would be no penalty assessed to local agencies for APE’s, and if there are no bonuses awarded to the State there will be no bonuses to the local agencies.
- The WCHSA-PAC wishes to have John return in October and discuss the QA sample process.
- John H. reminded this group that to be penalized a state has to be over the national average two years running, so Wisconsin would only have a sanction potential in 2005 if FFY 2003 and 2004 are both over the average.

- Jackie B expressed concern that the loss of staff at the local level due to funding cuts will adversely affect the error rate, despite the efforts to enhance CARES and training, and Reduced Reporting policy.
- John H. noted that while the caseload has gone up substantially the error rate continues to drop, so perhaps staff cuts won't have a major deleterious effect.

PAC FYI's on their Reports:

There was concern that some of the PAC reports contain FYI's on information they have discovered. With reduced reporting requirements, the customer was not required to report many items, but once the agency is notified by PAC it is something the agency must now act on. Lisa will check with Judy Johnson to see what they have been doing. Since PAC is now concentrating on actions at applications and recerts, this should be stuff that needed to be reported, but she will discuss with them to see if they are reporting info between certs that the customer didn't have to give.

Draft Admin Memo on Benefit Recovery of Claims:

Rick Z. presented a draft Admin Memo laying out the what's, why's etc. of benefit recovery. Because of the low claim establishment which FNS has pointed out, a reiteration of local agency obligation to create claims, and the situations where claims are required is in order. It is discussed in terms of maintaining program integrity and as an income source in tight budget times.

- The PA group liked the separate discussion of each program in which claim determination and benefit recovery should occur.
- IMAC has created an ad hoc committee on Program Integrity and Fraud Prevention to assess goals and see how the state can better meet them while still relieving workload pressures at the local level
- Childcare has a large potential for recovery because national indicators show a large percentage of error. The Feds have been approached by Wisconsin for a CC demonstration grant to address this. Also DWD is considering looking at a % incentive to agencies to promote recovery.
- . The PA Subcommittee is urged to contact Rick with suggested changes to the Admin Memo.

Draft Admin Memo on MER:

Marilyn Rudd is working on an Admin Memo to describe the FS. Management Evaluation Review (MER) process. Marilyn and AAA's are already working with agencies on the 2003 MERS. This is a federally mandated process and the report to FNS is already in final stages.

- The State must visit one-third of the agencies each year. Wisconsin has pulled Medicaid into the questions/discussions at the visits. FNS has announced that In 2004 FNS will also be accompanying the State AAA's to the Milwaukee County visit.
- It was agreed that information on error rates and types is helpful for the local agency to have prior to the visit. A discussion on getting agencies access to

Newman and training of accessing reports in Newman would be good; Pam said the AAA's may be interested in assisting with this.

Draft Admin Memo on QA Plans and Customer Service:

Customer Service:

Marilyn R. has also written a draft Admin. Memo on the QAP and Customer Service processes. Since Quality Assurance should encompass good customer service it seemed good to fold the two concepts together.

- Some at the meeting mentioned they use a customer satisfaction survey to monitor the latter; the Memo is more specific about what good customer service entails. There is concern about how much work that would mean for agencies if they need various measurements to determine their success at good service.

QA Plans:

- Some mentioned that their plan revolves around the "2 second party reviews per worker," as their primary goal.
- Some mentioned that they don't think the "2 per worker" concept addresses some problems, and they'd like more flexibility—such as an average of two for the total number of ESS in the agency—so they could address workers with the most needs and not review successful workers' cases. Another suggestion was a plan that reviews a percentage of total caseload. The group seemed in favor of flexibility, as long as there was some definable goal, not just "will attempt to review cases".
- According to the Admin Memo, the expectation is that all programs will be reviewed; there was a question whether agencies have to staff/time to do so right now.
- Pam L. thinks the AAA's could assist with QA plan development with agencies.

Marilyn R. is requesting input from group members, and a revised memo will be shared at our next meeting.

Next Meeting:

- **Date: October 27, 2003**
- Agenda items will include: Admin Memos; Goals for Future (Estimating Error Rate document handed out by John).
- Minutes will be taken by: Bernadette Connolly.

These minutes submitted by Marcia Williamson